

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for his detailed and thorough examination of the application. For reasons that follow, and in light of the numerous amendments herein, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application.

The §112 Issues

The Examiner has objected to the phrase "substantially continuous" as indefinite. In response, applicants have replaced "substantially continuous" with "continuous" throughout the claims.

The Examiner has objected to the phrase "behave substantially like screen saver programs" as indefinite. In response, applicants have replaced the phrase with "comprise screen saver programs."

The Examiner has objected to the phrase "substantial non-assigned task-related processes" as indefinite. In response, applicants have eliminated the word "substantial" from the phrase.

The Examiner has objected to the phrase "substantially uninterrupted" as indefinite. In response, applicants have replaced "substantially uninterrupted" with "uninterrupted" throughout the claims.

Finally, the Examiner has noted that it is unclear how the claimed activity monitor programs may "comprise screensaver programs." Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants respectfully suggest that a "screensaver program" is well-known as "a software program that displays constantly changing images or dims the brightness of a display screen after a predefined period of user interface inactivity, and restores the screen to its normal state immediately upon detection of user interface activity." As such, a screensaver program is inherently a type of "activity monitor program."

The Prior Art Rejections

The Examiner has rejected all of the claims as either anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,098,091 ("Kisor") or obvious in light of Kisor, combined with other references or known principles. As amended herein, all of the rejected claims require "continuous" monitoring of one sort or another. The Examiner's position is that Kisor's statement that "the connection between the remote computer and the central computer is reestablished periodically to verify the status of the tasks and confirm that the task is being completed on schedule" (Kisor, at 6:45-48) suffices to meet the "continuous" monitoring requirement of the claims. Applicants respectfully disagree.

However, in order to make the distinction between applicants' invention and Kisor even clearer, applicants have amended each of the independent claims to further recite the presence of, and/or interaction with, a plurality of supervisory programs. Neither Kisor, nor any of the other references, teach such use

of plural supervisory programs, as now claimed, to enhance reliability and/or performance. Accordingly, there is now little doubt that the claims, as amended herein, recite patentable distinctions over Kisor and the other references applied by the Examiner.

Finally, applicants note that certain minor amendments have been made to correct typographical, grammatical, and/or claim dependency problems noted by applicants' attorney in reviewing the claims.

WHEREFORE, applicants respectfully request that claims 1-86, as amended herein, be allowed.

Dated: 11/15/04

Respectfully submitted,



David Garrod, Ph.D., Esq.
(Reg. No. 35,149)

Goodwin Procter LLP
599 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022

(212) 459-7392